



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the words of the classics to suit his own purposes. This is far from being the only instance where he has done the same thing.

The rights of woman and the taxation of land values are two subjects which are handled by the author with the same disregard of the actual existing facts. But perhaps the most glaring defect in the whole of Dr. Chen's book is his tirade against Christianity, with which he concludes. He deliberately states that "China enjoys complete religious freedom"; while the "Sacred Edict," the Tientsin massacre, the Boxer outrages, and a long series of other disgraceful facts show the very opposite. He tells us that "all the good points of Christianity are found in Confucianism, and besides Confucianism gives still more. From the philosophical standpoint Christianity is not so deep or so rich as Confucianism, nor as Buddhism and Taoism. From the practical standpoint Christianity is not so human or so related to man as Confucianism. . . . It is opposed to the feelings of the people. In the first place it is antagonistic to their ancestor-worship. In the second place it has been introduced by arms, protected by treaties and extra-territoriality. . . . In the third place there are exceedingly few Chinese who honestly become Christians."

It is doing a real kindness to Dr. Chen and his readers to refer them to a book entitled *Letters to a Chinese Official, Being a Western View of Eastern Civilization*, by William Jennings Bryan. In that little treatise will be found a much better refutation of the views advanced by Dr. Chen than could be condensed into this short review.

In conclusion it is extraordinary that an institution with the prestige of Columbia University should publish such a work as the one under review without first giving it a thorough revision, eliminating its various inaccuracies, and modifying its exaggerated statements. If this had been done Dr. Chen's otherwise excellent and valuable treatise would justly deserve a far higher place in the world's literature than it is likely to attain.

F.

#### HOSKIER'S STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT VERSIONS<sup>1</sup>

In two stout volumes on the origin of the versions of the Gospels, (1910, 1911), Mr. Hoskier seeks to deal with the perplexing problem of textual variations in our oldest witnesses, and sets up the theory that

<sup>1</sup> *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N. T.* Remarks suggested by the study of  $\mathcal{P}$  and the Allied Questions as regards the Gospels. By H. C. Hoskier. 2 vols., xvi+469 and viii+423 pages. London: B. Quaritch, 1910, 1911.

*Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version: Covering a Detailed Examination of the Text of the Apocalypse and a Review of Some of the Writings of the Egyptian Monks.* By H. C. Hoskier. viii+203 pages. London: B. Quaritch, 1911.

they are the result of copying from polyglot exemplars. Back of Sinaiticus indeed, Mr. Hoskier thinks he can observe the influence of a trilingual (Syriac-Greek-Latin) or even a quadrilingual (Syriac-Coptic-Greek-Latin) polyglot. In support of this idea, he appeals to the fact that ancient codices sometimes show three or even four columns, and he might have adduced Origen's Hexapla to the same purpose. He further presents a mass of individual textual notes, with an occasional paragraph of bold generalization: The Syriac underlying the Diatessaron (for Mr. Hoskier holds there was such a Syriac) early influenced the Old Latin; Syriasms are apparent in the text which Justin used; in short, the earliest Old Latin manuscripts show that about 100 A.D. they were using Greek and Syriac together (p. 342). Vol. II (the appendices) is mainly devoted to collations of the Fleury Palimpsest (*h*), the Book of Dimma, and the Book of Moling. For his chosen position that Greco-Syriac bilingual texts shaped Greek, Latin, and Syriac and even Coptic texts, and that bilingual, trilingual, and even quadrilingual codices of which we have practically no record lay behind the whole process of textual modification, Mr. Hoskier adduces a series of readings and comments which may bewilder but will not convince the cold and critical reader. The most of this evidence is clearly capable of a much less picturesque explanation, as the result of ordinary mixture, harmonistic corruption, or easy transcriptional variation. That it all demands for its explanation Mr. Hoskier's quaint theory few will believe, while the extreme positions in which that theory involves its advocates and the anterior improbability of the existence or use of such polyglots in antiquity complete its discomfiture. Mr. Hoskier's view might have been more clearly and compactly and less dogmatically presented. In particular his criticisms of Dr. Hort's textual methods and conclusions suggest that he, like many of Hort's critics, has not fully understood them.

Recent study of the Coptic versions has led some scholars to transfer the origin of the Bohairic version from the third century to the seventh. This view fits badly with Mr. Hoskier's theory of quadrilingual polyglots, more especially as his "Coptic" always includes the Bohairic (II, 406). It is natural therefore for him to come to the relief of the Bohairic. In his new volume on the date of that version, he reiterates his contention that a great quadrilingual polyglot lies back of Sinaiticus, and undertakes to support this view by lists of readings in the Apocalypse, and by a collection of readings supposedly of Bohairic origin from Egyptian writers of the fourth century. Some of this evidence may be interpreted quite as well in the opposite direction, and

some of it proves altogether too much. Thus if Macarius' use of *voûs* for *καρδία* in Matt. 6:21 "shows the retranslation of one familiar with Coptic and Greek" (p. 126), what does the same thing in Justin (*Apol.* 15:16) show? Coptic idioms in the Greek writings of Macarius and Serapion do not prove the existence of the Bohairic version in their day. The late date of the Bohairic made so probable by the work of Guidi, Leipoldt, and others must be challenged, if at all, on stronger grounds than these.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### EARLY CHRISTIAN MARTYROLOGY

The moving stories of martyrdom and miracle told in the texts here published<sup>1</sup> contain very little historical truth—not much more, indeed, than the names, and not even all of these. As an unconscious and unintentional reflection of eastern Christianity's life and thought in the times when those Christian legends known as Saints' Lives were in process of evolution, these martyrologies with their literary offspring are of somewhat greater historical value. There are, furthermore, some hints as to the conditions of life in general in Edessa and the surrounding country in the centuries during which the mercenary armies of Byzantium haunted those regions in the constant wars of eastern Rome against the Sassanid Persians. But the chief value of the texts does not lie in the historicity of their contents.

As the name of the first collector and sifter of much of the material here published, Oscar von Gebhardt, would lead us to expect, it is the textual history, the transmission of the texts by copy and translation and again by copy of the translation, the use of them in song and sermon and liturgy, with the influence of one upon the other threading back and forth, that gives interest and value to these legends and homilies and justifies so extensive and expensive a publication of them. The book is published as a posthumous work of Oscar von Gebhardt, edited by Ernst von Dobschütz. And it is true, as stated above, that the idea of the publication emanated from von Gebhardt and much of the material had been collected by him. Yet, not only was no small portion of this material far from ready for publication at von Gebhardt's death, but von Dobschütz has added not a little of his own finding and work. In

<sup>1</sup> *Die Akten der edessenischen Bekenner Gurjas, Samonas und Abibos*. Aus dem Nachlass von Oscar von Gebhardt herausgegeben von Ernst von Dobschütz. Texte und Untersuchungen, herausgeg. von Harnack und Schmidt, XXXVII, 2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911. lxviii+264 pages. M. 12.